

From: [ANDERSON Jim M](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: FW: Comment Clarification
Date: 08/13/2008 01:36 PM
Attachments: [CommentClarification.doc](#)

Eric,

You asked for comments re: the Comment Clarification document the LWG 1st prepared, & which you summarized & prepared draft responses. I sent you the e-mail below 7/15, & am re-sending it just to make sure you had it. These are DEQ's final comments on the document.

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: ANDERSON Jim M
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2008 9:59 AM
To: 'blischke.eric@epa.gov'
Cc: POULSEN Mike; MCCLINCY Matt; PETERSON Jenn L
Subject: FW: Comment Clarification

Eric,

I took a quick look at your 6/25 "Comment Clarification" e-mail in preparation for tomorrow's TCT mtg. You did a typically great job of capturing everything & providing a clear path forward. I pretty much agree with all your summaries & proposed resolutions, but I have several thoughts.

1) General Comment- Your proposed resolution to a number of comments ends with notes saying further clarification or discussion is needed. What is the process & schedule for providing further clarification & having the discussions? What are the time-critical issues?

2) Comment 4 (p.1 of your e-mail)- I agree with your resolution, but I thought the individual Section Ex Summaries in the RD2 Rpt were good & would encourage the LWG to produce Section Ex Summaries along with a Comprehensive Ex Summary.

3) Comment 104 (p.2 of your e-mail)- I agree the draft RI Rpt should focus on defining source areas, defining the flow path/concentrations, & using that information to evaluate TZW risk. However, EPA's comment also says the loading scale may not be relevant when looking at effects to the benthic community. Why can't we develop a site-specific EPC using site-specific TZW data to evaluate risk to the benthic community?

4) Comment 211 (p.5 of your e-mail)- You didn't include anything in the "Resolution" column, but I understood the LWG agreed to discuss uncertainty in individual sections & in the Uncertainty Section of the BRA.

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: POULSEN Mike [<mailto:Mike.Poulsen@state.or.us>]
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2008 12:34 PM
To: ANDERSON Jim M
Subject: FW: Comment Clarification

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov [<mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2008 4:15 PM

To: Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Fuentes.Rene@epamail.epa.gov; POULSEN Mike; PETERSON Jenn L; rgensemer@parametrix.com

Cc: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov

Subject: Comment Clarification

A week or so ago, I sent out a list of Round 2 Report comments that the LWG was requesting clarification on or are subject to future discussions (e.g., stormwater loading methods, PRG development). I have gone through the LWG comments, paraphrased them (always dangerous) and offered up some resolutions. For some comments, I need more information from commenter or additional internal discussion is required. My summary is attached.

Please read through the comment list. If your name is next to a proposed resolution, please let me know whether the resolution is adequate. In some cases, I have requested clarification.

Please look at this by next week's TCT. I would like to go through this table at that time.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks, Eric

(See attached file: CommentClarification.doc) <<CommentClarification.doc>>